

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

A. Status of All of the Claims

Claims 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, and 24-26 have been amended, and claim 28 has been added. Consequently, claims 14-28 are currently pending and under consideration.

It is believed that the above-identified new and amended claims are supported by the application as originally filed. No new subject matter has been added.

B. Objections to the Drawings Should be Withdrawn

In the current Office Action, the drawings were objected for allegedly not explicitly calling out the different components. Through this Response, Applications are submitting the attached, replacement drawing of Fig. 1. Applicants have attempted to more clearly identify the various components illustrated in Fig. 1. Applicants have also amended the specification on pages 10 and 11 in order to coincide with the new reference numerals of Fig. 1. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request the current objection be withdrawn.

C. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph Should be Withdrawn

Claims 14-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Through the amendments made herein, Applicant submits that the § 112 issues have been properly addressed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the current rejection be withdrawn.

D. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) Should be Withdrawn

In the current Office Action, claims 14-20 and 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,073,727 to DiFranza et al. Claims 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiFranza in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0007987 to Amo et al.

As the Examiner is likely well aware, the Patent Office has the burden of presenting a prima facie case of anticipation. It is well settled law that a “claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” See MPEP § 2131. In the present case, it is respectfully submitted that the Office has failed to present a prima facie case of anticipation. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the anticipation rejections be withdrawn.

Because claim 14 represents the only independent claim presently pending, the following technical comments, observations, and analyses focus on claim 14, consistent with the overall teachings of the present invention and consistent with what is thoroughly explained in the specification. As amended, independent claim 14 specifically recites “wherein the visualization of display elements (a_{1-n} , b_{1-n} , c_{1-n} , d_{1-n}) on a first display device (1) and the visualization of display elements (a_{1-n} , b_{1-n} , c_{1-n} , d_{1-n}) on at least one additional display device (1) takes place in a chronologically and spatially coordinated manner, wherein said at least one additional display device is visually coordinated with said first display device”.

It is clear after a thorough reading of DiFranza that the reference does not expressly or inherently describe a method for the visualization of digital display elements in which the display elements are displayed in a chronologically and spatially coordinated manner on at least two display devices. DiFranza provides a system for displaying video information to passengers of an elevator in accordance with a play list defining a sequence of messages. Each building 14 includes a building server 28 which interfaces with production center 20 via Internet 24 to develop presentations of merged advertising and general information to be exhibited on elevator display units 10. Col. 4, ll. 27-31. Building server 28 is responsible for downloading the building play list from production center 20, retrieving over Internet 24, the specified advertisement and general information, followed by assembling and distributing the advertisement and information within displays which are to be viewed in elevator display units 10. Col. 5, ll. 36-52.

One of the objectives of the present disclosure is to provide a method for the visualization of display elements which are displayed on more than one display device in a chronological and spatially coordinated manner. By coordinating a plurality of illustrations and/or information (display elements) on a plurality of display devices which are visually coordinated with one another, an overall impression of the display elements on the different display devices is created

and displayed to a viewer. The DiFranza reference, in contrast, provides no disclosure or teaching directed to a chronological and spatial coordination of display elements over elevator display units 10. DiFranza only appears to disclose the simultaneous displaying of information at fixed times and for fixed durations across all elevator display units in a particular building. Therefore, DiFranza is incapable, likely because it was not the purpose of the reference, of creating an overall impression by presenting display elements on a plurality of display devices.

Accordingly, the DiFranza reference does not disclose or suggest a methodology for the visualization of digital display elements in which the display elements are displayed in a chronologically and spatially coordinated manner on at least two display devices. Therefore, DiFranza does not disclose each and every element of independent claim 14 and thus does not anticipate claim 14. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Claims 15-28 depend from independent claim 14 either directly or indirectly. On at least that basis, these claims should be allowed. They may also be allowable on their own merit.

E. New Claim 28 Is Allowable Over the Art of Record

New claim 28 depends from claim 14 and therefore includes all of the limitations of claim 14. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Applicants' claim 14 is allowable over the references of record for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14. They may also be allowable on their own merit.

F. Conclusion

It should be understood that the above remarks are not intended to provide an exhaustive basis for patentability or concede the basis for the rejections in the Office Action, but are simply provided to overcome the rejections made in the Office Action in the most expedient fashion.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. If after reviewing this amendment the Examiner feels that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative by telephone to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

By James M. Durlacher
James M. Durlacher, Reg. No. 28840
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137
Telephone: (317) 634-3456 Fax: (317) 637-7561
Email: jdurlacher@uspatent.com